

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of the application as set out in the outstanding office action. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

A listing of the claims in this case is set out above. Claim 26 is canceled by this paper. Claims 27, 29, 31, 33 are amended by this paper.

In the outstanding office action, Claims 27, 5, 14, 21, 28, 29; 34, 31, 35; and 33, 36 stand rejected under Section 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 31, 35 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Meyer in view of Loo et al. ("Loo"). Claims 33 and 36 have been rejected as being unpatentable over "Nishikawa" in view of Meyer and Loo. Claims 27, 5, 4, 21 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Loo in view of Meyer.

The rejection of Claims 33 and 36 based on Nishikawa in view of Meyer and Loo is not understood. There is no "Nishikawa" reference of record in this application. The previous rejection of these claims was based on the Nakahara reference in combination with Meyer and Loo. For purposes of this response, applicants will assume that the reference to "Nishikawa" is in error, and that the office action intended to refer to Nakahara. If this understanding is incorrect, the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a new office action, with a copy of the newly cited reference, and a re-started time for response. Turning now to the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested. The limitations identified in the office action, i.e. "selectable individually and in parallel combinations," are fully supported by applicants' specification, e.g., at 23:12 to 24:9, and FIGS. 19-20. The Examiner asserts that the specification does not provide support that both a single reactance and a parallel combination of reactances are selected at any one time as recited by the amended claim limitations. However, the claim limitations do not recite that both a single reactance and a parallel combination of reactances are selected at any one time. Further, to further

address this ground of rejection, Claims 27, 29, 31 and 33 are amended. For example, Claim 27 as amended recites that "said plurality of susceptances can be selected in parallel combinations." Similar amendments are made to the other amended claims. These amendments should be entered under 37 CFR 1.116, since they put the case in condition for allowance, and do not raise additional issues.

For these reasons, the rejection under Section 112 should be withdrawn.

The rejections under Section 103 are also respectfully traversed, for reasons already of record. The Examiner admits that the references do not teach selection of reactances in parallel combination. Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding objections and rejections have been addressed, and the application is now in condition for allowance. Such favorable reconsideration is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 30,021



Leonard A. Alkov, Attorney for Applicants

Tel. No.: 310.647.2577  
Fax No.: 310.647.2616

Raytheon Company  
P.O. Box 902 (E1/E150)  
El Segundo, CA 90245-0902